

Carol THOMAS, Pro Se  
 854 E Pacific Ave  
 SF, CA 94133  
 415 316 2372  
 Jabez1.1@aol.com

(5)

FILED

JUL 07 2016  
 SUSAN Y. SOONG  
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CAROL THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

San Francisco Housing Authority and Amanda  
 Vernon

Defendant(s).

1815 Egbert Ave.  
 SF, CA 94124

Housing Discrimination and  
 Retaliation

CV16 3819

Complaint

EDL

Jury by Trial Demanded

My case belongs in federal court under federal question jurisdiction because it is about federal laws or rights which is Civil Rights. Disparate Treatment based on race discrimination. Refused unit transfer for accommodation.

The plaintiff alleges that the defendant is retaliating against her by not correcting the amount of money the entity claimed she owed during the investigation of her previous complaint with HUD and before the filing of her first retaliation complaint against them. The plaintiff alleges that during the first retaliation complaint she stated to the defendant that the inflated amount was in error however no corrections were made after informal and formal grievance meetings with SFHA nor during or after the HUD retaliation complaint or the HUD reconsideration. The plaintiff alleges that the defendant never proved that the increased amount of money they claimed the plaintiff owed was valid. The plaintiff alleges that the investigator of her previous complaint stated in her final conclusion to

1 close the case on August 4, 2014, that "SFHA showed proof by paperwork that the error was corrected and that the  
2 respondent said thank you". Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not provide for a request for  
3 reconsideration. My Title VIII complaint was the only complaint reviewed for reconsideration.

4 The plaintiff alleges that this statement made by SFHA was not accurate and that she have twenty four  
5 monthly rental statements (dated from 2013 – July 2016) substantiating her allegations.

6 The plaintiff further alleges that the defendant is retaliating against her by not addressing the issue regarding the  
7 damage caused to her carpet during the most recent annual inspection of her unit and refusing to pay for the  
8 damages.

9 The last denial from SFHA occurred on or around June 1, 2016. The most recent date on which the alleged  
10 discrimination occurred on June 01, 2016 and is continuing.

11 The acts alleged , if proven, may constitute a violation of the following sections:

12 804b or f, and 818 of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended by the Fair Housing Act of 1988.

13 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

14 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is  
15 true and correct to the best of my knowledge.  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



Carol Thomas, Pro Se  
July 7, 2016